

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 27-54 are pending in the application, with claim 27 being the single independent claim. No claims are sought to be cancelled. New claim 54 is sought to be added, and claims 27 and 32-50 are amended herein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 27-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,698,306 to Prosise *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, claim 27 recites “a plurality of susceptors *impregnated* in said *thermo-malleable material*.” The Prosise *et al.* reference teaches a microwavable tile or dish used to heat baked good in a microwave. The tile is made from “a sodium silicate foam dielectric substrate 21 [and] a dry layer of a microwave active coating (MAC) 22 overlaying the substrate 21.” (Col. 6, line 35-37; Fig. 2A.) The substrate is formed by providing a sodium silicate slurry and a foam aid and dried with heat. (Col. 4, lines 40-51.) However, the sodium silicate foam is not a thermo-malleable material. At no time is heat applied to soften the material, as is described in the present application. Further,

the MAC, which is the portion that includes the susceptor material identified by the examiners, is not impregnated within the sodium silicate foamed substrate, but is instead applied to an exterior of the foam substrate by “using an ordinary paint roller” and allowed to dry (Col. 13, lines 17-18). Thus, the Prosise *et al.* reference does not anticipate “a plurality of susceptors impregnated in said thermo-malleable material” of the claimed invention, nor is this feature obvious from the Prosise *et al.* reference.

Further, claim 27 has been amended to add that a layer including a thermo-malleable material that, “when softened by said heat is malleable to conform to a complex curvature of an object.” However, the tile described in the Prosise *et al.* reference teaches against the sodium silicate substrate being malleable when softened by heat considering that the sodium silicate substrate is “capable of withstanding and maintaining temperatures in excess of 1000°F.” (Col. 3, lines 38-42). In fact, a cooking utensil that softens when heated would not be an effective cooking utensil. Thus, the Prosise *et al.* reference does not anticipate a layer that “when softened by said heat is malleable to conform to the complex curvature of said object,” nor is this feature obvious from the Prosise *et al.* reference.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over the Prosise *et al.* reference and the favorable treatment of claim 27-54 with respect thereto.

The Examiner further rejected claims 27-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,855,818 to Gan *et al.* As discussed above, claim 27 has been amended to add that a layer including a thermo-malleable material that, “when softened by said heat is malleable to conform to a complex curvature of an object.” The

Gan *et al.* reference is directed to a foam that has an electro-dissipative effect. (Col. 4, lines 32-35 and 47-56.) However, the Gan *et al.* reference does not teach that the foam may be softened by heat and malleable to conform to a complex curvature of an object. In fact, since the foam taught by the Gan *et al.* reference may be used in electrophotographic equipment (col. 3, lines 61-67), where softening when heated would not be desirable, it is clear that this feature is not presently described nor obvious from in the Gan *et al.* reference.

In addition applicants have added claim 54, which is supported by the specification on page 8, lines 1-13, which discusses limiting arcing. Claim 54 recites that “the amount of susceptor is limited such that there is no electrical transfer between susceptor particles.” As such, the Gan *et al.* reference, which teaches the dissipation of electrical charges, does not have each feature of claim 54. As such, the newly added claim 54 is patentable over the Gan *et al.* reference.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over the Gan *et al.* reference and the favorable treatment of claim 27-54 with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


Rae Lynn Prengaman
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 53,482

Date: 04/12/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

248255_1.DOC